

The Office Action admits that Wolff fails to disclose this feature (the Office Action on pages 3 and 4).

Ackaret fails to make up for at least this deficiency of Wolff. The Office Action asserts that paragraph [0002], lines 1-8, of Ackaret discloses the above feature. Ackaret discloses that techniques for printing electronic forms through the World Wide Web are well known (paragraph [0002], lines 1-2). Ackaret discloses that a series of HTML commands recognizable by a web browser are used to render a document (paragraph [0002], lines 5-6). Ackaret also discloses that in the case of a form, such HTML commands are interpreted by different web browsers in slightly different manners (paragraph [0002], lines 6-8). Thus, the asserted section of Ackaret discloses rendering the form by recognizing the series of HTML commands. In other words, Ackaret discloses how to rendering the form. However, the asserted section of Ackaret fails to disclose how the printing of the form is performed. Specifically, Ackaret fails to disclose automatically printing an image data having a fill-in area when it is determined that the web page includes the input field.

The remainder of Ackaret are also silent about this feature. For example, Ackaret discloses that a client machine 12 selects and requests a form 16 to be printed (see, e.g., paragraphs [0031] and [0033]). In addition, as Ackaret discloses that a server 14 contains many forms and the client machine 12 selects the form to be printed (e.g., abstract and paragraph [0031]), Ackaret also fails to disclose the concept of automatically printing a form. Thus, Ackaret fails to disclose the above feature of claims 1, 8, 16, 17, 18 and 20.

Thus, Wolff and Ackaret, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious the above feature of claims 1, 8, 16, 17, 18 and 20. For at least this reason, claims 1, 8, 16, 17, 18 and 20 are patentable over Wolff and Ackaret. Further, claims 6, 7, 14, 15 and 23-27 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over Wolff in view of Ackaret and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093378 (Silverbrook).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the allegation that the combination of Wolff and Ackaret would have rendered obvious the above features of claims 1 and 8. As discussed above, Wolff and Ackaret fail to have rendered obvious at least these features. Further, Silverbrook fails to make up for the deficiency of Wolff and Ackaret. Thus, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

*H. Yamashita*

James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Hirotsuna Yamashita  
Registration No. L0563

JAO:HQY/emd

Date: October 21, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---